



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/673,157

09/30/2003

Kurt A. Dobbins

0016.0024US1

9786

29127

7590

12/08/2008

HOUSTON ELISEEVA
4 MILITIA DRIVE, SUITE 4
LEXINGTON, MA 02421

EXAMINER

BURGESS, BARBARA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2457

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/673,157	Applicant(s) DOBBINS, KURT A.	
	Examiner BARBARA N. BURGESS	Art Unit 2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed September 16, 2008. Claims 1-25 are presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-17, 19, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Der Schaar (hereinafter "Van", US Patent Publication 2003/0135863 A1) in view of Feuerstraeter et al. (hereinafter "Feu", US Patent Publication 2003/0123393 A1).

As per claim 1, Van discloses a method of offering preferred transport in a network, the method comprising:

receiving a first part of a content transmission in the network (paragraphs [0025, 0040]);

receiving an indication of transport parameters in the network, the indication being associated with the content of the content transmission (paragraphs [0027, 0032]);

receiving a second part of the content transmission in the network (paragraphs [0040,

0046);

transmitting the second part of the content transmission in the network in accordance with the transport parameters (paragraphs [0068, 0070]).

Van does not explicitly disclose:

receiving an indication of predetermined transport parameters in the network, the indication being associated with the received first part of the content transmission

However, in analogous art, Feu teaches identifying a received capability associated with one or more priority levels of Ethernet traffic for a network device. The subset of content is sent to a destination device. A control message is received having class of service, type of service, quality of service indication denoting a priority level. Once this message is received, the content forwarding is resumed according to the priority level of the control message (paragraphs [0018, 0030-0031, 0035, 0038-0039].

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Feu's predetermined transport parameters and indication associated with the received first part of the content transmission in Van's method enabling communication for a given priority level.

As per claim 2, Van discloses a transmission device comprising:

a data receiver configured to receive a first part of a content transmission and an indication of transport parameters associated with the content of the content transmission network (paragraphs [0027, 0032]);

a service logic for grouping the first part of the content transmission and subsequent parts of the content transmission as a communications flow (paragraphs [0025, 0040]);
a transmission logic for determining the transmission parameters of the content according to the indication of transport parameters (paragraphs [0068, 0070]);
a switching apparatus for transporting the first part and subsequent parts of the content transmission in the network to a communications port according to the communications flow determined by the service logic (paragraphs [0046, 0070]);
a data transmitter configured to transmit the subsequent parts of the content transmission in the network in conjunction with the communications port in accordance with the transmission parameters determined by the transmission logic (paragraphs [0068, 0070]).

Van does not explicitly disclose:

receiving an indication of predetermined transport parameters in the network, the indication being associated with the received first part of the content transmission
However, in analogous art, Feu teaches identifying a received capability associated with one or more priority levels of Ethernet traffic for a network device. The subset of content is sent to a destination device. A control message is received having class of service, type of service, quality of service indication denoting a priority level. Once this message is received, the content forwarding is resumed according to the priority level of the control message (paragraphs [0018, 0030-0031, 0035, 0038-0039]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Feu's predetermined transport

parameters and indication associated with the received first part of the content transmission in Van's method enabling communication for a given priority level.

As per claim 3, Van discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the first part of the content transmission is a command for a particular content transmission (paragraph [0025]).

As per claim 4, Van discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein the command is a request command for a particular content transmission (paragraph [0019]).

As per claim 5, Van discloses the method according to claim 4, wherein the command is an HTTP GET request command (paragraph [0019]).

As per claim 6, Van does not explicitly disclose the method according to claim 5, wherein the command includes the indication of transport parameters, and wherein the indication of transport parameters includes a content tag.

However, in an analogous art, Feu teaches content received from a source at the host is tagged with priority level. The priority level gives details of flow of the content (paragraphs [0030-0031, claim 20]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Feu's content tag in Van's method in order to determine the priority level of the content.

As per claim 7, Van discloses the method according to claim 5, wherein the command includes information that is utilized in the return path for the content transmission (paragraph [0038]).

As per claim 8, Van does not explicitly disclose the method according to claim 5, further comprising:

receiving a response to the command, wherein the response includes a content tag.

However, in an analogous art, Feu teaches content received from a source at the host is tagged with priority level. The priority level gives details of flow of the content (paragraphs [0030-0031, claim 20]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Feu's content tag in Van's method in order to determine the priority level of the content.

As per claim 9, Van discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising:
authenticating a distribution allowed for the content transmission, and
authorizing only the allowed distribution of the content transmission (paragraph [0025]).

As per claim 10, Van discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the
transportation parameters include a preferred level of transport (paragraph [0028]).

As per claim 11, Van discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the transport
parameters include at least one selected from a group consisting of a predetermined
amount of bandwidth, a predetermined quality of service, a predetermined transmission
attribute, a predetermined amount of packet loss, and a predetermined amount of jitter
(paragraph [0035]).

As per claim 12, Van discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising:
decrypting the indication of transport parameters (paragraph [0040]).

As per claim 13, Van discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein receiving a
first part of the content transmission in the network includes receiving the first part of the

content transmission in a node of the network along a transmission path of the content transmission (paragraph [0038]).

As per claim 14, Van discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the content transmission includes application data (paragraph [0019]).

As per claim 15, Van discloses the transmission device according to claim 2, wherein the first part of the content transmission is a command for a particular content transmission (paragraph [0020]).

As per claim 16, Van discloses the transmission device according to claim 15, wherein the command is a request command for a particular content transmission (paragraph [0019]).

As per claim 17, Van discloses the transmission device according to claim 16, wherein the command is an HTTP GET request command (paragraph [0018]).

As per claim 18, Van does not explicitly disclose the transmission device according to claim 17, wherein the command includes the indication of transport parameters, and wherein the indication of transport parameters includes a content tag.

However, in an analogous art, Feu teaches content received from a source at the host is tagged with priority level. The priority level give details of flow of the content (paragraphs [0030-0031, claim 20]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Feu's content tag in Van's method in order to determine the priority level of the content.

As per claim 19, Van discloses the transmission device according to claim 17, wherein the command identifies a return path for the content transmission (paragraph [0060]).

As per claim 20, Van does not explicitly discloses the transmission device according to claim 17, wherein the data receiver is further configured to receive a response to the command, wherein the response includes a content tag.

However, in an analogous art, Feu teaches content received from a source at the host is tagged with priority level. The priority level give details of flow of the content (paragraphs [0030-0031, claim 20]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Feu's content tag in Van's method in order to determine the priority level of the content.

Art Unit: 2457

As per claim 21, Van discloses the transmission device according to claim 2, wherein the transport parameters include a preferred level of transport (paragraph [0028])

As per claim 22, Van discloses the transmission device according to claim 21, wherein the transport parameters include at least one selected from a group consisting of a predetermined amount of bandwidth, a predetermined quality of service, a predetermined transmission attribute, a predetermined amount of packet loss, and a predetermined amount of jitter (paragraph [0035]).

As per claim 23, Van discloses the transmission device according to claim 2, further comprising:

a decryption element configured to decrypt the indication of transport (paragraph [0040]).

As per claim 24, Van discloses the transmission device according to claim 2, further comprising:

an authentication element configured to authenticate a distribution allowed for the content transmission (paragraph [0038]);

an authorization element configured to authorize only allowed distribution of the content transmission (paragraph [0045]).

As per claim 25, Van discloses a method of offering preferred transport in a peer-to-peer network, the method comprising:

receiving a first part of a content file transmission in the peer-to-peer network (paragraph [0038]);

receiving an indication of transport parameters in the peer-to-peer network, the indication being associated with the content of the content file transmission (paragraph [0035]);

receiving a second part of the content file transmission in the peer-to-peer network (paragraph [0040]); and

transmitting the second part of the content file transmission in the peer-to-peer network in accordance with the transport parameters (paragraph [0048]).

Van does not explicitly disclose:

receiving an indication of predetermined transport parameters in the network, the indication being associated with the received first part of the content transmission

However, in analogous art, Feu teaches identifying a received capability associated with one or more priority levels of Ethernet traffic for a network device. The subset of content is sent to a destination device. A control message is received having class of service, type of service, quality of service indication denoting a priority level. Once this message is received, the content forwarding is resumed according to the priority level of the control message (paragraphs [0018, 0030-0031, 0035, 0038-0039]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Feu's predetermined transport parameters and indication associated with the received first part of the content transmission in Van's method enabling communication for a given priority level.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BARBARA N. BURGESS whose telephone number is (571)272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Barbara N Burgess/
Examiner, Art Unit 2457

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2457

December 2, 2008

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457